



Call for papers for “Theoretical traditions in social values for sustainability”

Christopher M. Raymond¹ · Jasper Kenter^{2,3} · Dave Kendal⁴ · Carena J. van Riper⁵ · Andrea Rawluk⁶

Published online: 21 February 2018
© Springer Japan KK, part of Springer Nature 2018

The content and structure of social values has been an area of substantial scholarship in the social sciences over the past 60 years, and is gaining attention in conservation and sustainability literatures (Dietz et al. 2005; Hicks et al. 2016). Scholars have explored basic human values, also referred to as held, core or transcendental values, which describe the abstract principles that guide people’s approaches to living in the world. Research has focused on assessing the universal content or structure of these basic values within and across cultures (often drawing on Schwartz 1994), and their influence on attitudes and environmental behavior (often building on Stern et al. 1999). Less frequently, these basic human values have been linked to ecosystems and their services in individual and group contexts (Hicks et al. 2016; Manfredó et al. 2016; Raymond et al. 2014; Raymond and Kenter 2016).

A contrasting approach focusses on the value ‘of’ things in the world. This has traditionally been the primary value domain within economics. In ecological economics, emphasis has increasingly been placed on assessing the social values assigned to place-based attributes and their consequences for management of sustainability problems (e.g., Lo and Spash 2013; Hansjürgens et al. 2017; Kenter et al. 2016;

Spash 2017). There has also been an explosion of interest in the mapping and non-monetary assessment of contextual or assigned values linked to the way individuals perceive people, places or things (Raymond et al. 2009; van Riper et al. 2012; Brown and Fagerholm 2014). Contributions also link transcendental and contextual values, as in the cases of relationality in narratives, lived values and value hierarchies (O’Neill et al. 2008; Manfredó et al. 2009; Ives and Kendal 2014; Kendal et al. 2015; Rawluk et al. 2017).

We now see a ‘third wave’ of value concepts responding to the need to recognize local and indigenous perspectives (Díaz et al. 2015), bridge instrumental and intrinsic values (Chan et al. 2012) and recognize the relational nature of social values (Chan et al. 2016; Kenter et al. 2015; Klain et al. 2017). These relational value concepts have been integrated into the ‘nature’s contributions to people’ framework adopted by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (Pascual et al. 2017). However, such frameworks are not fully grounded in the long history and broader context of social values theory development and application across multiple disciplines. For example, they do not clearly discuss their relation to transcendental and contextual values, call on earlier relational value concepts in environmental ethics (e.g., narrative values; O’Neill et al. 2008), or reference literature on value change and formation (e.g., Bardi and Goodwin 2011) and value articulating institutions (e.g., Vatn 2009).

In response, this special feature will be the first to present a holistic perspective on the theories underpinning social values research that is applicable to sustainability science problems on a continuum from transcendental to contextual theory and applications. It will be of interest and benefit to the *Sustainability Science* readership given it will unlock a large body of literature on the concept of values and provide guidance on how to theorize and apply established social value concepts in current sustainability problems. This includes how to integrate values collected at different scales into international biodiversity assessments, address multiple

✉ Christopher M. Raymond
christopher.raymond@slu.se

¹ Department of Landscape Architecture, Planning and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Alnarp, Sweden

² Scottish Association for Marine Science, Oban, UK

³ University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

⁴ Geography and Spatial Sciences, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

⁵ Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

⁶ Ecosystem and Forest Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

aspects of ‘relationality’ when valuing ecosystem services, and align epistemology, research paradigm and research methods when applying value concepts. It will build upon a recent special issue in *Ecosystem Services* (edited by Kenter 2016) by offering theoretical and disciplinary depth from case examples with a global geographic scope.

Aims and scope of special feature

This special feature (SF) aims to present and share diverse theoretical, conceptual and methodological traditions in social values for sustainability, as well as case applications relevant to sustainability science and management. The SF will contribute to enhanced understanding of relational dynamics in sustainability science, and contribute to advancing important post-2020 conservation agendas, including the interests of IPBES and the Convention of Biological Diversity.

The SF will start with a group of papers representing different points on the transcendental-contextual values continuum. We welcome additional contributions on the following themes:

- Interpretive approaches to exploring social values, relations and sustainability (e.g., hermeneutic, discursive, dialogical, and phenomenological approaches).
- Theories that underpin research on the relationships between values, sense of place and sustainability.
- Comparison of different meta-theories of social values and their applicability to sustainability planning and management.
- Cross-cultural comparisons of social values for sustainability.
- Assessment of value shifts relevant to sustainability planning and management.
- Novel approaches for understanding the theoretical intersections between relational values and social values and their collective contribution to sustainability science scholarship.
- Political and institutional dimensions of social values in relation to sustainability.

Submission and review process

Authors are encouraged to submit extended abstracts (maximum 500 words) to the editors of the SF. Upon acceptance, authors will be invited to submit full-length manuscripts to the editorial team at socialvaluesSF@gmail.com. We will then hold a workshop to ensure coherent use of terms across papers and develop a synthesis of ideas. Authors will then be invited to submit full-length manuscripts through the

journal’s electronic editorial management (EM) system, keeping in mind publisher formatting guidelines and length requirements. At this point, authors should state that they are submitting their work to be considered for the “Theoretical traditions in social values for sustainability” SF. Papers will go through a blind review process.

Author’s guidelines <http://www.springer.com/environment/environmental+management/journal/11625/PSE?detailsPage=press>.

Important dates and deadlines

- **March 16, 2018: submission of extended abstracts** (maximum 500 words) to editorial team: socialvaluesSF@gmail.com
- **June 8, 2018: Submissions of full papers** to the editorial team: socialvaluesSF@gmail.com
- **June 26–27, 2018: Social values workshop** in the UK to ensure coherent use of terms and to build the social values international network. This workshop (including costs for travel arrangements) will be supported by the UK Valuing Nature Programme. It is expected that one author from each paper can attend this workshop. Further details to be advised upon abstract acceptance.
- **July 27, 2018: submission of revised papers** through EM system. For submission through EM system, please register in EM system (link below) and submit your article selecting the SF title. You can see an author tutorial on right side of the registration page. Please tag your submission with the SF tag “Theoretical traditions in social values for sustainability”. <http://www.editorialmanager.com/sust/mainpage.html>
- Mid-late 2019: expected publication of the SF.

References

- Bardi A, Goodwin R (2011) The dual route to value change: individual processes and cultural moderators. *J Cross Cult Psychol* 42:271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110396916>
- Brown G, Fagerholm N (2014) Empirical PPGIS/PGIS mapping of ecosystem services: a review and evaluation. *Ecosyst Serv*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.10.007>
- Chan KMA, Guerry AD, Balvanera P et al (2012) Where are cultural and social in ecosystem services? A framework for constructive engagement. *Bioscience* 62:744–756. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2012.62.8.7>
- Chan KMA, Balvanera P, Benessaiah K et al (2016) Why protect nature? Rethinking values and the environment. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 113:1462–1465. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525002113>
- Díaz S, Demissew S, Carabias J et al (2015) The IPBES conceptual framework—connecting nature and people. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain* 14:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.11.002>

- Dietz T, Fitzgerald A, Shwom R (2005) Environmental values. *Annu Rev Environ Resour* 30:335–372. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144444>
- Hansjürgens B, Schröter-Schlaack C, Berghöfer A, Lienhoop N (2017) Justifying social values of nature: economic reasoning beyond self-interested preferences. *Ecosyst Serv* 23:9–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.11.003>
- Hicks CC, Levine A, Agrawal A et al (2016) Engage key social concepts for sustainability. *Science* 352:80
- Ives CD, Kendal D (2014) The role of social values in the management of ecological systems. *J Environ Manag* 144C:67–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.05.013>
- Kendal D, Ford RM, Anderson NM, Farrar A (2015) The VALS: A new tool to measure people's general valued attributes of landscapes. *J Environ Manag* 163:224–233
- Kenter JO (2016) Editorial: shared, plural and cultural values. *Ecosyst Serv* 21:175–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.10.010>
- Kenter JO, O'Brien L, Hockley N, Ravenscroft N, Fazey I, Irvine KN, Reed MS, Christie M, Brady E, Bryce R, Church A, Cooper N, Davies A, Evelyn A, Everard M, Fish R, Fisher JA, Jobstvogt N, Molloy C, Orchard-Webb J, Ranger S, Ryan M, Watson V, Williams S (2015) What are shared and social values of ecosystems? *Ecol Econ* 111:86–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.01.006>
- Kenter JO, Jobstvogt N, Watson V, Irvine KN, Christie M, Bryce R (2016) The impact of information, value-deliberation and group-based decision-making on values for ecosystem services: Integrating deliberative monetary valuation and storytelling. *Ecosyst Serv* 21:270–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.06.006>
- Klain SC, Olmsted P, Chan KMA, Satterfield T (2017) Relational values resonate broadly and differently than intrinsic or instrumental values, or the new ecological paradigm. *PLoS One* 12:e0183962. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183962>
- Lo AY, Spash CL (2013) Deliberative monetary valuation: in search of a democratic and value plural approach to environmental policy. *J Econ Surv* 27:768–789. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2011.00718.x>
- Manfredo MJ, Teel TL, Henry KL (2009) Linking society and environment: a multilevel model of shifting wildlife value orientations in the Western United States. *Soc Sci Q* 90:407–427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00624.x>
- Manfredo MJ, Teel TL, Dietsch AM (2016) Implications of human value shift and persistence for biodiversity conservation. *Conserv Biol*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12619>
- O'Neill J, Holland A, Light A (2008) *Environmental values*. Routledge, London
- Pascual U, Balvanera P, Díaz S et al (2017) Valuing nature's contributions to people: the IPBES approach. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.12.006>
- Rawluk A, Ford RM, Neolaka FL, Williams KJ (2017) Public values for integration in natural disaster management and planning: a case study from Victoria, Australia. *J Environ Manag* 185:11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.10.052>
- Raymond CM, Kenter JO (2016) Transcendental values and the valuation and management of ecosystem services. *Ecosyst Serv* 21:241–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.07.018>
- Raymond CM, Bryan BA, MacDonald DH et al (2009) Mapping community values for natural capital and ecosystem services. *Ecol Econ* 68:1301–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.12.006>
- Raymond CM, Kenter J, Plieninger T, Turner N (2014) Comparing instrumental and deliberative paradigms underpinning the assessment of social values for cultural ecosystem services. *Ecol Econ* 107:145–156
- Schwartz SH (1994) Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *J Soc Issues* 50:19–45
- Spash C (2017) *Routledge handbook of ecological economics*. Routledge
- Stern PC, Dietz T, Abel T et al (1999) A value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: the case of environmentalism. *Hum Ecol Rev* 6:81–97
- van Riper CJ, Kyle GT, Sutton SG et al (2012) Mapping outdoor recreationists' perceived social values for ecosystem services at Hinchinbrook Island National Park, Australia. *Appl Geogr* 35:164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2012.06.008>
- Vatn A (2009) An institutional analysis of methods for environmental appraisal. *Ecol Econ* 68:2207–2215